



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

syntactical study Professor Fay uses a novel manner of exposition. He emphasizes again and again that the Latin language is a puzzle. He finds, as do many, the real superiority of Latin in its difficulty, because it does not yield its meaning easily, and he urges the innate liking of the human mind for any variety of a puzzle. Here again I am afraid that he is carried away by his own enthusiasm. The human mind delights in puzzles but not in the same puzzle. A few years ago everywhere men and women could be discovered poring over picture puzzles. Now this is rarely seen. In fact the success of any puzzle depends upon its novelty. Therefore the Latin language should not be regarded merely as a puzzle, for as a puzzle it would soon lose its power to interest. There is something deeper. It is the picture which the combined linguistic parts make up that holds the interest. When the picture ceases to be worth studying, the puzzle ceases to attract; hence many who love Latin literature restrict the study of it to the 200 years from 100 B. C. to 100 A. D. and do not strain their partiality by pushing into the decadent period.

We must, however, all agree with Professor Fay that the fact that Latin does not give up its secrets without thought, as much modern literature does, constitutes its enduring strength and its enduring charm.

G. L.

#### GREEK LITERATURE<sup>1</sup>

Among the many apocryphal stories of the puzzled schoolboy one of the most delightful tells of a youth who was asked to give a brief account of the Ancient Greeks. He wrote: "The Ancient Greeks were that marvelous nation that lived all at the same time, and all in the same place, and always thought just alike". And as I think of certain widely prevalent ideas about the ancients a picture comes into my mind: an engraving entitled *The Age of Pericles*, showing the great Athenian haranguing (no other word will do) a motley group of heroic figures, all quite undisturbed by the hammering and pounding of masons and carpenters close by, who are busily engaged in erecting the Parthenon and the Propylaea.

We hear much loose talk of *The Greek Spirit* and *Greek Ideals*; but if we ask what they were, we often find conceptions not very different from those of the puzzled schoolboy and the artist of *The Age of Pericles*. And really it is no wonder. The oldest literary monuments in the Greek language, the *Homeric Poems*, must, it seems to me, have assumed practically their present form by 800 B. C.

<sup>1</sup> A lecture delivered as one of a course of Lectures on Literature at Columbia University in 1909-1910 and published together in 1911 by The Columbia University Press. Since most of our readers are not likely to possess this book it has seemed worth while to reprint, with the consent of their authors, this lecture and another on *Latin Literature*, by Professor N. G. McCrea.

C. K.

On the other hand, about the latest of the authors who preserved or reproduced in imitation the truly classical spirit, Lucian, may have lived till about 200 A. D. That is a stretch of a thousand years during which countless minds of the greatest keenness worked at the creation and perfection of new types of literary form, or the perpetuation of the types that had best stood the test of use. But those thousand years by no means represent the whole life of ancient Greek literature. The *Homeric Poems* mark the close, not the beginning, of a long literary epoch. Their language is not entirely homogeneous,—far from it. It gives us no true picture of a dialect really spoken by any community, at any one period or in any one region; it contains elements of several dialects, fused with great skill into an artistic blend. Indeed, there is something to be said for the famous theory of Fick, that the *Homeric Poems* were originally composed in a non-Ionic (or "Aeolic") form of Greek, and afterwards transposed (to use a musical term) into a new form, of prevaillingly Ionic type. But whatever may be the genetic history of this wonderfully rich and supple *Homeric* language, its subsequent career is fairly well known. For hundreds of years it was in constant use as a conventional literary language, undoubtedly committed to writing, yet designed chiefly for oral use, and certainly through many generations of men employed principally in this way. Of it Professor Gilbert Murray truly says:

The ordinary audiences must have understood it as well as, for instance, our audiences understand the authorized version of the Bible, though the differences between Jacobean and Victorian English are utterly trifling compared with those between Homer and the prose speech of the earliest Ionic inscriptions. And how wonderfully the poets themselves knew it! Even under the microscope of modern philology the Epic dialect appears, in the main, as a sort of organic whole, not a mere mass of incongruous archaistic forms. And this language has been preserved and reconstructed by generations of men who never spoke it except when they recited poetry. It was understood by audiences who never heard it spoken except when they listened to poetry. And not a man among them had had any knowledge of the laws of language; they had only a sense of style.

A sense of style! In the last analysis an utterly inexplicable possession, a Heaven-sent gift, capable of development but hardly to be produced where it is not found existing already. It was the incomparably good fortune of the Greeks to possess that sense, as it is the heritage of the Irish people, and in a different phase, of the French, in the modern world. The Greeks, moreover, possessed the knack of turning it to account, of following its promptings and heeding its warnings, in endless details of life. "Greek dramas and Greek temples", says Professor Percy Gardner, "are parallel embodiments of the Greek spirit, and he who would understand that spirit

must know something of both. Greek history, whether of politics or colonization or trade or religion or literature or art, is all one, and every branch throws back light on the other branches".

This sense of style shows itself in full bloom in the Homeric poems, and has entire mastery of the language developed under its guidance. It is already a chastened and sober style when it first appears to us, for all its intensity and variety; remarkably free from extravagance or violence, abhorring ugliness and clumsiness. It is a thoroughly sophisticated style, far removed from a mere untutored grace, completely conscious of the means by which it produces its effects. It is essentially the style of a school. At its previous history we can only guess; but we may safely guess that generation after generation of poets worked over it, choosing elements here and there, smoothing down any roughness, and replacing unmanageable forms by those of some other dialect not too different to seem congruous. The day has gone forever when it could be believed that such poems, in such a style, represented a primitive stage of Greek civilization; and such terms as *The Dawn Age* and *Mr. Gladstone's Juventus Mundi* are as misleading as they are pretty. The Dawn Age of Greek civilization lies far back of any period that we have yet been able to reach, or even to approach.

The posterior limit of ancient Greek literature is hardly less difficult to set with accuracy. The current of Greek language continued to flow with less abrupt turns, and far fewer actual interruptions, than was the fate of Latin; and though the ancient variety of dialects disappeared under the dominating influence of the so-called *κοινή*, or universal dialect, developed out of the Attic, this universal dialect became and remained the idiom of a widely spread though very heterogeneous population. As the medium through which the gospel of Christianity was at first preached, and as the vehicle of the highest civilization thus far developed, the later form of Greek gained a prestige that insured its persistence through many centuries down to the present time. This persistence through persecution and political decay, through scattering and isolation of communities, and through theological dissensions of unexampled bitterness is one of the most striking phenomena of history.

But the creative power of the Greeks underwent a notable change in the centuries immediately preceding and following the birth of Christ. The vigorous imagination, the keen power of analysis, the insatiable thirst for knowledge, the eagerness to work out new forms, gradually disappeared. The literary treasures of past centuries were already overwhelmingly abundant, so that preservation became of prime importance, and creation succeeded best when it took the form of imitation of the great

models. This is why, for all except the professed scholar, the history of ancient Greek literature is as good as ended with Lucian. The literature of Byzantium or Constantinople is like that of another people, though the language is nearly the same as before. The sense of style is not indeed dead; the ancient models were too good to lose their usefulness or attractiveness; but external conditions are altogether different. A new faith, with an authoritative creed resting on revelation, with an organized and centralized hierarchy, and a political world of absolutism, contrast sharply with the extremely elastic religious belief and practices and the kaleidoscopic variety of constitutions and states prevailing down to the time of Alexander the Great. The pious Fathers of the Church saw in the intensely human deities of their ancestors but devils and demons and fallen angels still dangerous to the soul of the good Christian. Yet a fortunate tolerance and an admiration, sometimes outspoken, sometimes no doubt prudently concealed, for the great works of antiquity, led to the preservation and copying of these. . . .

With the Mss., however, of ancient Greek authors fortune has played some strange pranks. Out of the hundreds of tragedies produced at Athens between 500 and 400 B. C. only thirty-two have come down to us: seven of Aeschylus, seven of Sophocles, and eighteen of Euripides. But Aeschylus is known to have written at least eighty plays, Sophocles over a hundred, Euripides over ninety. Of what must have been a vast mass of early heroic epic poetry only the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* survive, no doubt the noblest of the whole body of epic poems, yet differing only in degree of excellence, not in kind, from the others. The field of Greek lyric poetry is like the surface of the Acropolis at Athens as one sees it to-day, a bewildering accumulation of fragments, many of exceeding beauty, but broken and battered, sometimes almost beyond recognition. Greek lyric is known to us nowadays chiefly through quotation in later Greek writers; quotation either in the body of an independent work for illustration or argument (so, for example, the longest fragment of Simonides's poetry that exists is quoted piecemeal in the *Protagoras* of Plato, and discussed and pulled to pieces by the persons of the dialogue), or in collections of *Elegant Extracts*, preserved without explanatory framing, like jewels without setting. From this statement Pindar and Bacchylides must be excepted; we have many Mss. of Pindar, and the one of Bacchylides just now referred to. The whole body of historical works of the fourth century B. C., and the entire Middle and New Comedy, has as good as perished except in so far as the latter has survived in the 'adaptations' of Plautus and Terence; and in the works of Aristotle are huge gaps. One particularly valuable fragment of Aristotle (not

universally acknowledged as genuine), containing the greater part of his Constitution of Athens, was found in 1890, and it contains a number of previously unknown verses by Solon. Of Plato, on the other hand, we seem to have all that he ever published, in fact more, as some of the extant dialogues ascribed to him are certainly spurious.

When so much is lacking from the literature once in existence it is well to be cautious in making sweeping statements about it. The discovery of a piece of papyrus in an Egyptian tomb may suddenly upset many carefully formed theories. . . .

However, even after all the vast losses from the once existing body of Greek literature, enough remains to reveal to us the range and power and originality of the Greek genius. We are still far from understanding all that we have of that literature; and what has been interpreted to one generation of moderns needs reinterpretation to the next, for the point of view inevitably shifts with the lapse of years. Even the individual scholar finds, in his old age, a meaning and a message in his beloved authors which he had failed to find, or had viewed with half-seeing eyes, in his youth. There is hardly an ancient Greek author whose works, carefully and thoroughly studied, will not throw light upon those of all other Greek authors. Moreover, within the last thirty years such advances have been made in archaeology and anthropology that the whole problem of comprehending the vast structure of ancient civilization, Greek as well as Oriental, has been practically restated, and wholly new factors have entered into the equation. Greek literature is too completely an outgrowth of Greek life to be intelligible except as that life is intelligible; and for the comprehension of that life new helps are furnished on every side, new sources of knowledge are available to the student of to-day of which our fathers never dreamed. The Greek-speaking peoples, formerly thought of as a pure and homogeneous race, are now seen to have been rather of extremely mixed parentage, held together in a very precarious union perhaps quite as much by pressure from without as by natural and mutual attraction. Greek civilization we might describe as a new and splendid pattern worked upon a background of older and quite different forms of culture, and the old forms often show through and between the lines of the later design. 'Purity of race' is a phrase that is anthropologically discredited: "Greek is as Greek does".

It will be best, considering the extent and variety of this Greek literature to which I am directing your attention, to choose a few of its chief characteristics, as they appear to me, for closer examination.

The first characteristic is that of extreme variety. Adopting the traditional division into poetical and prose literature, we find that the Greeks gave

artistic development successively to *epic poetry* both heroic (Homeric Poems) and didactic (Hesiod); to *philosophical poetry*, in which the external form is that of the epic, that is, the hexameter; to *elegiac* and *iambic poetry*, both named from the form of verse, not from the subject-matter or mode of treatment; to a very elaborate form of *choral lyric*, employed at festivals and on other public occasions, and by the side of this to a purely *personal, subjective lyric*, in a form admirably suited to the expression of intense emotion; then to *dramatic poetry*, both tragic and comic (there is no prose drama in ancient Greek literature that has survived, though the famous 'mimes' of Sophron would doubtless fall under that head); and to *bucolic* or *pastoral poetry* of Theocritus and his school, the last independent form of poetry to be cultivated among ancient Greeks.

Turning to prose, in every sense a secondary form of literature, we may follow the development in succession of *philosophical, historical, and oratorical prose*. Out of the fusion of these originally separate forms issues what may well be called the universal prose style—of course showing many variations and modifications at the hands of individual writers—which becomes the pattern for the prose of the whole Western world.

The origination and development of all these forms of literary expression were not the achievement of the Greek-speaking people as a whole, still less of any one part of them. We come now to one of the most notable phenomena in literary history: the traditional divergence of dialect between the different branches of Greek literature. In the glory of having assisted to perfect the many forms of literary Greek many different communities or 'tribes'—to use a conventional but very misleading term—had a share. These various communities spoke widely different forms of Greek, some of which are only imperfectly known to us, whether from scanty literary remains, or a few unimportant and half-decipherable inscriptions, or the incomplete accounts given by grammarians and lexicographers of Alexandrian and Roman times. The speech of outlying communities like Aetolians, Macedonians, many of the Cretan towns, and the like must have been nearly unintelligible to the more highly civilized and refined people of the central cities; even the dialect of Elis, the region of Olympia, where thousands upon thousands of Greek-speaking people congregated every four years throughout many centuries, was always regarded as particularly crabbed and difficult. A modern parallel is the case of Oberammergau, in the Bavarian Highlands, whither the decennial Passion Play brings myriads of Germans to whom the untempered speech of that region is as strange as Dutch or Flemish.

This literary development by regions or localities—I intentionally avoid the word 'tribes'—had a

striking result: a certain 'dialect' became so to speak obligatory for each of the great classes of literature. That is to say, when a particular branch of Greek-speaking people gave typical development to a particular species of literature, the dialect in use among them, their vernacular, served as the material out of which a linguistic vehicle of expression for that form of literature was wrought. Furthermore (and this is the point to be chiefly remembered), that vehicle, thus created, was adopted by Greeks of other regions and other vernaculars when they composed works of a similar kind. For example, the elaborate and artificial epic dialect seems to have received its final form among Ionian Greeks of Asia Minor; but in succeeding ages whoever composed epic poetry, whatever might be his native dialect, used as a matter of course this same epic dialect, so far as he had mastered it. So, again, the language of choral lyric, conventionally a sort of fusion of several non-Ionic dialects, but chiefly Doric, was employed as well by the Ionic-speaking Simonides and Bacchylides as by the naturalized Lacedemonian Alkman and the Boeotian Pindar. A partial exception to this rule is seen in the case of the Lesbian dialect employed by Alcaeus and Sappho, which hardly appears again in Greek literature; partly because that style of poetry went out of fashion, partly, doubtless, because the dialect was so distinctively and peculiarly local that it was too difficult of acquisition, and not rich enough for general use in the expression of a wider range of ideas. . . .

The various local dialects, however, thus taken for use as literary mediums, underwent many modifications. They were most severely pruned and trimmed, and on the other hand enriched by borrowings from other dialects of Greek. It must be remembered that the literary language is essentially an artificial language. The vernaculars are the real living language, not mere corruptions of the literary speech. But a mere vernacular tongue is rarely suited to serious literary production; for one reason, because it is of very limited range. At an early period in their literary history the Greeks felt this to be true. They developed not one indeed but several literary languages. It is interesting and instructive to compare the language of Pindar with that of his countrywoman and elder contemporary, Corinna, so far as the latter is known and accessible from a few short fragments. Corinna's language is of an extreme dialectal type, and must have been very difficult to Greeks not already acquainted with the Boeotian dialect; while Pindar employs a vocabulary and forms which can have offered but little trouble to any educated Greek, difficult as his train of thought must often have been to follow.

The several principal forms of Greek literature, then, grew up in the environment of different parts

of the Greek-speaking world, and preserved to the last many linguistic peculiarities of their originators. To the Ionians belongs the chief share of the glory of having put the Homeric Poems into their final shape, of developing a somewhat different vocabulary and inflection for use in the elegiac and iambic poetry, and of working out for the first time, not only in the history of Greek literature but so far as we know in the history of literature at all, a really artistic prose style. What Greek prose might have continued to be but for the artistic feeling of Ionian writers, we may see from the clumsy, disjointed deliverances of some of the earlier philosophers, as preserved to us in detached quotations by later authors. This Ionic prose was eclipsed by the greater Attic style, but not before it had found in the incomparable Herodotus an exponent whose narrative exerts an undying charm.

The choral lyric, or poetry designed to be sung at occasions of public ceremony or worship, seems to have been cultivated most successfully as a whole among Dorian communities, and its characteristics are in the main those traditionally ascribed to Dorian Greeks: sobriety, stateliness, dignity. Yet the two greatest names in Greek choral lyric are those of a Boeotian and an Ionian, of Pindar and Simonides; and the language of choral lyric is not really Dorian any more than it is Aeolian. The Dorian character comes out most plainly in the meters employed, the most stately to be found anywhere in Greek poetry. A striking illustration of this persistence of literary dialect is afforded by the Attic drama. In Greek tragedy, as is of course well known, certain interludes or *entr'actes* were sung by a trained chorus who executed a sort of pantomimic dance in accompaniment. The language of these interludes differs from that of the rest of the play by admitting certain forms of non-Attic type, but only in passages intended to be sung; a sort of reminiscence of an earlier period when the drama consisted of little else than a series of choral odes. The so-called 'Doric forms' of certain words, as used in these odes or interludes, are in reality not specifically Doric at all.

The drama is essentially an Attic product. Very possibly the beginnings of dramatic development are due to non-Attic Hellenes, but the Attic people, the Athenians, succeeded in making the drama so completely their own that their claim to inventorship is practically undisputed. In fact, from about 500 B. C. onward, Athens often plays the rôle of appropriator of other states' goods, and gets much credit for introducing, as new, ideas which had really been first broached elsewhere. So with the comic drama: there is good reason to believe that it was composed and performed among certain Dorian peoples, particularly at Megara and in Sicily, long before it was

taken up at Athens; but the skill and cleverness of Athenian writers, and the transcendent genius of an Aristophanes, aided by the freedom of speech which was far greater at Athens than elsewhere, secured to Athens the monopoly, one might almost say, of this form of drama. Thus it comes about that the history of Greek drama is the history of Athenian drama. So again with oratory, a point to which I shall revert presently. And it is worth while to remember that the population of Attica was probably one of the most mixed in Greece, and the dialect better suited than any other to be the medium of dramatic and prose literature, as uniting in itself elements of many others. Of all the Greek dialects known to us the Ionic-Attic group shows the fewest archaic forms.

After Athens had thus gained the spiritual leadership of Greece no important new species of poetry seems to have been developed, though old forms underwent some important modifications, until after 300 B. C., when Theocritus, of whose life singularly little is known, introduced a new type, the bucolic or pastoral poetry. A Sicilian by birth, he lived on the island of Cos and at Alexandria. With wonderful skill he brought into literature the pastoral motives of his native country, idealizing the goatherds and shepherds into a form in which they became presentable at court, yet leaving them their depth and intensity of emotion and in the main their broad and homely dialect. The combination of this dialect with the hexameter verse, which had been hitherto almost exclusively Ionic in form, was in itself a notable contribution to literary art.

(To be concluded.)

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

E. D. PERRY.

### REVIEW

A Companion to Latin Studies. Edited by John Edwin Sandys. Cambridge (England): at the University Press (1910). xxv + 891 pages. \$6.50.

Second Notice (see pages 20-22).

The chapter on the Geography of Italy is written by Professor Sandys himself. The geography is described in the usual cut and dried fashion, giving the reader the necessary number of names and facts, and fulfilling its purpose of furnishing a good descriptive and reference chapter in the brief compass of thirteen pages. It remains only to note a few errors. Note 1, page 3, which professes to be a bibliography of the controversy concerning Hannibal's passage of the Alps, is almost without value. The latest book mentioned was printed over twenty-five years ago. Fuchs, Hannibals Alpenübergang (Wien, 1897), Osiander, Der Hannibalweg (Berlin, 1900), Lehmann, Die Angriffe der drei Barkiden auf Italien (Leipzig, 1905) should at least have been mentioned. On page 4, § 4, the author writes *Seni-*

*gallia* instead of *Sinigaglia*. On page 6, § 9, Tusculum is put on a wooded ridge of Mons Algidus, which is quite wrong, and on page 7 there is a sentence which means nothing at all: "<the Anio> afterwards washed the lower slopes of the Mons Sacer, and, uniting its waters to those of the Tiber, wound its way through the plain, where it received the sulphurous stream of the Albula". As a matter of fact the Albula runs into the Anio at Bagni, a little bathing resort near Tivoli, and then several miles further down stream the Anio flows past Mons Sacer, and still several miles further on it joins the Tiber.

The chapter on the Ethnology of Italy, pages 14-34, is from the pen of Professor William Ridgeway whose reputation as an ardent theorist, whether justified or not, makes one read with great care and some suspicion. It seems almost too good to be true to have the vexed questions of the identity of the Ligurians, Etruscans, and the Sabines settled so simply. Section 28, on pages 24 ff., sums up the archaeological evidence for the successive peoples in Central and Upper Italy in masterly style, whether or not the author is right in attributing his period IV (Villanova) to the Umbrian-Siculans, and period V (Terramare) to the Ligurians. He then goes on to say, after a few pages, that the patricians of Rome were Sabines, and the plebeians the aboriginal Ligurians, and that Latin is Ligurian. Now that may all be true, but it would certainly have been better for Professor Ridgeway to have supplied a larger bibliography than the very scant one he has given, and particularly to have mentioned the fact that there are other theories than his own. The chapter is more than interesting, more than suggestive: it is inspiring, but it is too cocksure.

Chapter III, History, in two parts, Chronology, pages 90-112, and Chronological Tables, pages 114-147, by Professor J. S. Reid, deserves nothing but praise. His treatment of the Calendar is ample, careful and not too detailed, and what he says about the Fasti and Chronological Discrepancies is direct, brief, and to the point, and his bibliography, while not at all exhaustive, is good. The Chronological Tables are well arranged, sufficiently full, and accurate.

Chapter VI, Public Antiquities, pages 243-520, contains sections upon the constitutional, legal, economic, and social sides of Roman history. Professor J. S. Reid writes the two sections on The Roman Constitution, pages 243-298, and on Law, pages 299-340. He commits himself at the outset to his firm belief in the unbroken evolution of Roman constitutional history, and adopts a double method, the historical and the expository, laying more stress and importance upon the former. "We have therefore to contemplate a process of evolution which plays around and affects the imperium", is the brief and expressive way that the author states his thesis. In speaking about the *rex*, Professor Reid may perhaps have gone